

Rebecca Davis (SBN 271662)  
rebecca@lozeaudrury.com  
**LOZEAU DRURY LLP**  
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510) 836-4200  
Facsimile: (510) 836-4205

Steven L. Woodrow (admitted *pro hac vice*)

swoodrow@woodrowpeluso.com

Patrick H. Peluso (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[peluso@woodrowpeluso.com](mailto:peluso@woodrowpeluso.com)

Taylor T. Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[tsmith@woodrowpeluso.com](mailto:tsmith@woodrowpeluso.com)

**WOODROW & PELUSO, LLC**  
3000 E. Main Street, Suite 300

3900 E. Mexico Avenue, Suite 300  
Denver, Colorado 80210

Denver, Colorado 80210  
Telephone: (720) 213-0671

Telephone: (703) 213-0676  
Facsimile: (303) 927-0809

Facsimile: (303) 927-0809

Attorneys for Plaintiff and

**Attorneys for Plaintiff and**

**UNITE  
NORTHERN**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Loretta Williams**, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

Case No. 3:22-cv-03789-SI

## **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

## **DDR Media, LLC, and Lead Intelligence, Inc.**

## Defendants.

Plaintiff Loretta Williams (“Plaintiff” or “Williams”) and Defendants DDR Media, LLC d/b/a Royal Marketing Group (“Royal Marketing”) and Lead Intelligence, Inc. d/b/a Jornaya (“Jornaya”, and collectively with -Royal Marketing, “Defendants”) jointly submit this Joint Case Management Statement pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California, Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Civil Local Rule 16-9.

1   1. Jurisdiction & Service

2                 Plaintiff's Position: This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action  
3 Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), *et seq.* ("CAFA"), because the class consists of over 100  
4 people, at least one member of each class is from a State other than the state of the Defendants,  
5 and the amounts in controversy are over \$5,000,000. Further, none of the exceptions to CAFA  
6 jurisdiction apply.

7                 Defendants' Position:

8                 *Royal Marketing's Position:* Plaintiff's named the incorrect party and agreed to correct  
9 same. DDR Media, LLC, -- at all relevant times was t/d/b/a Royal Marketing is currently waiting  
10 to be served properly under the correct tradename Royal Marketing Group. Plaintiff has agreed to  
11 amend the Complaint.

12                 *Jornaya's Position:* Jornaya does not dispute that it was properly served and is not aware  
13 of any party not yet served. Jornaya does not currently dispute this court's jurisdiction. Jornaya  
14 disputes DDR Media's position regarding the tradename under which it conducted business, and  
15 reserves all rights, claims, and defenses.

16

17   2. Facts

18                 Plaintiff's Position: This case challenges Defendants' violations of the California Invasion  
19 of Privacy Act, Cal. Penal Code 631 ("CIPA"). Specifically, Plaintiff Loretta Williams  
20 ("Williams" or "Plaintiff") alleges that Defendants violated CIPA by unlawfully intercepting and  
21 recording her communications on Royal Marketing's website absent any consent, thereby  
22 violating CIPA's prohibition of wiretapping and California's constitutional right to privacy.  
23 Accordingly, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and a Class of similarly situated individuals, brings  
24 this action to put an end to Defendants' serial violations of CIPA.

25                 Defendants' Position:

26                 *Royal Marketing's Position:* Royal Marketing denies the Plaintiffs' allegations and as will  
27

1 be further articulated in its response to the First Amended Complaint, pending filing of the  
2 amended complaint and service by the Plaintiff. Royal Marketing is a customer of Jornaya. This  
3 action arises from the implementation of Jornaya's Create JavaScript software on its website  
4 snappyrent2own.com.

5 *Jornaya's Position:* Plaintiff alleges that DDR Media LLC's use of Jornaya's Javascript  
6 on its website resulted in the unlawful interception and recording of her communications without  
7 her consent. Jornaya denies that it violated CIPA or acted unlawfully.

8  
9 3. Legal Issues

10       Plaintiff's Position:

11       (1) Whether Jornaya unlawfully intercepted Plaintiff's communications on the Royal  
12              Marketing website;

13       (2) Whether Jornaya obtained consent from all parties to intercept and record the  
14              communications at issue;

15       (3) Whether Royal Marketing aided, agreed, or conspired with Jornaya to unlawfully  
16              intercept, read, or learn the contents of Plaintiff's communications;

17       (4) Whether the proposed class can be certified as a class action in accordance with  
18              Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23;

19       (5) Whether Plaintiff and the other members of the Class are entitled to statutory  
20              damages; and

21       (6) Whether Defendants should be enjoined from intercepting and recording future  
22              communications on the Royal Marketing website absent any consent.

23       Defendants' Position:

24       *Royal Marketing's Position:* Royal Marketing is unaware of Jornaya's proprietary systems  
25              and processes, utilized them pursuant to the terms and conditions they establish, and – if liable of  
26              anything, is entitled to Indemnity by them. Moreover, Royal Marketing contests the requisite

1 number of putative Plaintiffs as to them given this was – essentially, a one-off use of the subject  
2 Platform.

3 *Jornaya's Position:* Jornaya does not dispute Plaintiff's identification of the key legal  
4 issues in this action. Jornaya does not agree that it owes indemnification to DDR Media LLC.

5 **4. Motions**

6 There is a pending Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint.

7  
8 Plaintiff's Position: Plaintiff anticipates moving for class certification following class  
9 discovery and potentially moving for summary judgment in favor of herself and the class  
10 members. Discovery motions may also be potentially necessary.

11 Defendants' Position:

12 *Royal Marketing's Position:* Royal Marketing: Defendant reserves the right to file discovery  
13 motions as necessary.

14 *Jornaya's Position:* Jornaya anticipates opposing class certification. Jornaya may move for  
15 summary judgment or summary adjudication and may also bring discovery motions, if any are  
16 necessary.

17  
18 **5. Amendment of Pleadings**

19 The parties request a deadline to amend pleadings to be set following a reasonable period  
20 of discovery to ascertain whether any additional culpable parties exist. A deadline of 120 days  
21 following commencement of discovery regarding class related issues would suffice.

22  
23 **6. Evidence Preservation**

24 The Parties certify that they have reviewed the ESI Guidelines. During the Rule 26(f)  
25 conference, counsel for the Parties discussed the potential ESI implicated in this case. The Parties  
26 confirm that any relevant ESI is being appropriately preserved. Should discovery proceed, the  
27

1 Parties are committed to working together to reduce the costs of ESI.

2 Royal Marketing has requested a Stop, Hold, Warn as to those documents and materials  
3 Plaintiff believes are relevant specifically from them because its' role in this – other than availing  
4 itself to co-defendants platforms, services, is nebulous.

5

6 **7. Disclosures**

7 The parties have agreed to exchange initial disclosures pursuant to the requirements of  
8 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 within fourteen (14) days following the issuance of the Rule 16 Scheduling  
9 Order and a ruling on the pending Motion to Dismiss.

10 The Parties agree that, in the interests of conserving the parties' and judicial resources, all  
11 discovery, including initial disclosures, should await resolution of Defendants' motion(s) to  
12 dismiss and any subsequent amendment of the complaint.

13 **8. Discovery**

14 No discovery has been served thus far and the parties have not identified any discovery  
15 disputes. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), the parties submit the following discovery plan:

16 **(1) Subjects on which discovery may be needed.** Discovery will be needed on the  
17 allegations asserted in the first amended complaint and the legal issues set forth above.

18 **(2) Issues relating to disclosure or discovery of electronically stored information.** If  
19 certain discovery is to be produced in electronic form, the parties have agreed to meet and  
20 confer, as necessary, to resolve any issues concerning electronic discovery as they arise.

21 **(3) Issues relating to claims of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation  
22 material.** The parties agree to prepare and produce a privilege log with respect to all documents,  
23 electronically stored information, things and oral communications withheld on the basis of a  
24 claim of privilege or work product protection except the following: written and oral  
25 communications between a party and its counsel after commencement of the action and work  
26 product material created after commencement of the action.

1                   **(4) Changes in limitations on discovery.** The parties do not propose any changes to the  
2 limitations on discovery imposed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Civil Local  
3 Rules.

4                   **(5) Orders that should be entered by the court.** The parties anticipate that a protective  
5 order governing the treatment of confidential information will be required and will submit a  
6 proposed order in the form of the Northern District's model order.

7  
8                   9. Class Actions

9                   The Parties set forth their positions with respect to discovery in Section 17 below.  
10

11                  10. Related Cases

12                  The parties are unaware of any pending cases related to this action.  
13

14                  11. Relief

15                  Plaintiff's Position: Plaintiff seeks statutory damages for Defendants alleged violations of  
16 CIPA, which provides for \$5,000 per violation, together with injunctive relief and attorneys' fees  
17 and costs. Damages will be calculated depending upon the number of class members and the  
18 number of violations following discovery.

19                  Defendants' Position:

20                  Royal Marketing's Position: Royal Marketing contends it has no liability, and that any  
21 liability, if any, found herein is co-defendants.

22                  Jornaya's Position: Jornaya denies that Plaintiff and the putative class are entitled to the  
23 relief sought in the complaint. Jornaya also denies that it owes any indemnification to DDR  
24 Media LLC.  
25  
26  
27

1       12. Settlement and ADR

2              The Parties have complied with ADR L.R. 3-5. The Parties are scheduled to participate in  
3 a private mediation session on August 14, 2023.

5       13. Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes

6              All Parties do not consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings.

8       14. Other References

9              The parties agree that the case is not suitable for reference a special master or the Judicial  
10 Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

12      15. Narrowing of Issues

13              The Parties agree, to the extent necessary, to explore facts that can be proven by  
14 stipulation at the appropriate time.

16      16. Expedited Trial Procedure

17              The Parties do not believe that this case is suitable for an expedited trial.

19      17. Scheduling

20              Plaintiff's and Defendant Royal Marketing's Position: Discovery should proceed with  
21 respect to both class certification and merits issues for a period of ten (10) months. The first eight  
22 (8) months will be devoted to written and oral fact discovery. The final two (2) months of this  
23 period will be devoted to experts. Following the close of this initial ten-month discovery period,  
24 the Parties will brief class certification. Following a ruling on class certification the Court would  
25 hold a subsequent case management conference and establish a schedule for the remainder of the  
26 case, including a period for any remaining merits-based discovery, and dates for summary

1 judgment briefing, pre-trial conferences, and the trial.

2 Plaintiff and Defendant Royal Marketing propose the following case schedule.

<u>Event</u>	<u>Proposed Deadlines</u>
Motion to Amend Pleadings and/or Add Parties	120 days following a ruling on the Motion to Dismiss
Deadline to Complete Fact Discovery	8 months following a ruling on the Motion to Dismiss
Plaintiff's Expert Disclosures Due	14 days after the Deadline to Complete Fact Discovery
Defendants' Expert Disclosures Due	14 days after Plaintiff's Expert Disclosure
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures Due	14 days after Defendants' Expert Disclosures
Complete Expert Discovery	2 months after the Deadline to Complete Fact Discovery
Plaintiff to File Motion for Class Certification	30 days following the completion of Expert Discovery
Defendants to File Opposition to Class Certification	30 days after Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification
Plaintiff to File Reply ISO Motion for Class Certification	14 days after Defendants' opposition
Subsequent Case Management Conference	TBD: to be set after a ruling on class certification

1	File Dispositive Motions	TBD: to be set after a ruling on class
2		certification

3

4                   Defendant Jornaya's Position:

5                   Defendant Jornaya's position is that, in the interests of conserving the parties' and judicial  
 6 resources, discovery should not begin until after resolution of the Defendants' motion(s) to dismiss.  
 7 Assuming such motions will be ruled upon by July 1, 2023, Jornaya proposes the following  
 8 schedule.

<u>Event</u>	<u>Proposed Deadlines</u>
Discovery Begins	July 1, 2023
Motion to Amend Pleadings and/or Add Parties	July 29, 2023
Deadline to Complete Fact Discovery	March 3, 2024
Plaintiff's Initial Expert Disclosures Due	March 17, 2024
Defendants' Expert Disclosures Due	April 14, 2024
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures Due	April 28, 2024
Complete Expert Discovery	May 19, 2024
Plaintiff to File Motion for Class Certification (and any supporting class-certification expert reports)	June 2, 2024
Defendants to File Opposition to Class Certification (and any rebuttal class-	June 30, 2024

26

27

28 4126-6953-6070.3                   9

1 certification expert reports)	
2 Plaintiff to File Reply ISO Motion for Class	July 21, 2024
3 Certification	
4 Subsequent Case Management Conference	TBD: to be set after a ruling on class
5	certification
6	
7 File Dispositive Motions	TBD: to be set after a ruling on class
8	certification

9

10 18. Trial

11 The Parties anticipate that a jury trial will take 5 days.

12 19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

13 Plaintiff's Position: As of the filing of this report, Plaintiff has filed her disclosure of non-  
14 party interested entities or persons.

15 Defendants' Position:

16 *Royal Marketing's Position:* Royal Marketing will file its Disclosure in connection with  
17 its response to the First Amended Complaint and as required by F.R.C.P. 26.

18 *Jornaya's Position:* Jornaya has filed its L.R. 3-15 Disclosure.

19 20. Professional Conduct

20 All counsel have reviewed the Guidelines.

21 21. Other

22 The parties are not aware of any other matters at this time.

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 Dated: July 21, 2023

3  
4 **LORETTA WILLIAMS**, individually and on  
5 behalf of all others similarly situated,

6 By: /s/ Patrick H. Peluso  
7 One of Plaintiff's Attorneys

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Rebecca Davis (SBN 271662)  
rebecca@lozeaudrury.com  
**LOZEAU DRURY LLP**  
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510) 836-4200  
Facsimile: (510) 836-4205

Steven L. Woodrow (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
swoodrow@woodrowpeluso.com  
Patrick H. Peluso (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
ppeluso@woodrowpeluso.com  
Taylor T. Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
tsmith@woodrowpeluso.com  
**WOODROW & PELUSO, LLC**  
3900 E. Mexico Avenue, Suite 300  
Denver, Colorado 80210  
Telephone: (720) 213-0676  
Facsimile: (303) 927-0809

Dated: July 21, 2023

**LEAD INTELLIGENCE, INC. D/B/A  
JORNAYA**

By: /s/ Rebecca C. Harlow  
Aravind Swaminathan  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe  
701 5th Avenue, Suite 5600  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 839-4300  
Fax: (206) 839-4301  
Email: aswaminathan@orrick.com

Rebecca Clair Harlow  
Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street

1 San Francisco, CA 94105  
2 (415) 415-773-5598  
3 Email: rharlow@orrick.com

4  
5 *Counsel for Jornaya*

6 Dated: July 21, 2023

7  
8 **DDR MEDIA, LLC d/b/a Royal Marketing**  
9 **Group**

10 By: /s/ Joseph A. O'Keefe

11  
12 Joseph A. O'Keefe  
13 McLeod | Brunger PLLC  
14 10375 Park Meadows DR., Suite 260  
15 Lone Tree, CO 80126  
16 (720) 443-6600  
17 jokeefe@mcleodbrunger.com

18  
19 *Counsel for Defendant DDR Media*  
20 *d/b/a Royal Marketing Group*

21  
22 **SIGNATURE CERTIFICATION**

23 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3) of the Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and  
24 Procedures Manual, I hereby certify that the content of this document is acceptable to counsel for  
25 Defendant and that I have obtained authorization to affix his or her electronic signature to this  
26 document.

27 By: /s/ Patrick H. Peluso  
28 Patrick H. Peluso

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above papers was served upon counsel of record by filing such papers via the Court's ECF system on July 21, 2023.

/s/ Patrick H. Peluso